

## **Remarks**

Prior to receiving the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-3 were pending. Claims 1-3 are being amended, and claim 4-13 are being added, leaving claims 1-13 for examination. Claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 11 and 13 are independent.

### **1. Drawing Objection**

The drawings were objected to for not including reference numerals 70 and 150, which were referred to in paragraphs [0008] and [0050], respectively.

Paragraph [0008], which is in the "Background of the Invention," describes prior art U.S. Patent No. 4,789,801 to Lee. More specifically, the first two sentences of paragraph [0008] describe FIG. 1B. The third sentence, which includes reference numeral 70, describes a further embodiment in Lee's '801 patent, for which a figure is not included in this application. Applicant has amended paragraph [0008] to make this clear, including removing reference to numeral 70. Specifically, paragraph [0008] has been amended to state that the "passive third array of electrodes" is not shown in the present figures, but is shown in FIG. 3 of Lee's '801 patent. As mentioned above, the discussion in paragraph [0008] is of the prior art, and does not specifically relate to the features being claimed in the present application.

In paragraph [0050], reference numeral 150 was meant to correspond to "outlet vents." However, it is clear from previous paragraphs [0034] and [0048], that the outlet or exhaust vents actually correspond to reference numeral 106. To correct this, paragraph [0050] has been amended to replace reference numeral 150 with reference numeral 106.

Applicants believe that the amendments that are being made to the specification do not add any new matter. Applicants also believe that these amendments should be sufficient to overcome the objections to the drawings. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn.

### **2. Double Patenting Rejection**

Claims 1-3 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 17 and 18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,713,026.

Claims 1-3 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 16 and 17 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/706,390.

Claims 1-3 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 8 and 11 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/661,988.

Applicants have amended the claims to point out some significant features of the handle. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness type double patenting rejection be reconsidered by the Examiner.

### 3. Conclusion

The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Dec 1, 2004

By: Jeffrey R. Kurin  
Jeffrey R. Kurin  
Reg. No. 41,132

Fliesler Meyer LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: 415/362-3800  
Facsimile: 415/362-2928